

8



13-184  
Received & Inspected  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
APR 11 2014

Jack Donald, Ed.D.  
Superintendent

FCC Mail Room

Phillip Thompson, M.Ed.  
Assistant Superintendent

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

April 7, 2014

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am writing today in response to the FCC's Public Notice (PN): Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Focused Comment on E-Rate Modernization which, among other things, examines how to distribute \$2 billion in found funding for the E-Rate program. The E-Rate program currently represents the only source of federal funding aimed at educational technology and is critical in providing discounts to assist schools (like mine) to obtain affordable telecommunications and internet access. For our small (2500 students), rural county, the funding from the E-Rate program provides over \$120,000 in funds to help pay for technology needs that would otherwise be impossible to satisfy.

As the FCC moves forward with this PN, we urge you to ensure that changes to modernize the program are focused on expanding a successful program that has yet to reach its full potential. E-Rate has served as the cornerstone to the rapid and dramatic expansion of school and library connectivity. The current program, while needing some marginal updates to its structure, is most strained by increasing demand for E-Rate-supported services and persistently low funding. The single most effective step the FCC can take to bolster E-Rates current and future success is to provide \$5 billion in funding, an amount commensurate with current demand. The final proposal must include both programmatic restructuring and a permanent increase in the program's funding cap. Quite simply, an infusion of funding without programmatic restructuring is a poor investment, and programmatic restructuring without permanent, adequate funding sets the program on a path towards instability and failure.

The \$2 billion (over two years) in found funding for E-Rate is a strong step in the right direction, as is focusing the funds on Priority Two (internal connections). Connectivity is an annual expense, though, and I am concerned that the proper focus on modernization and build out will come with sustained increased program demand that far exceeds the current program funding level and the inevitable funding cliff that will come when the \$2 billion is spent down. In fact, the most recent application cycle for E-Rate (closing March 26, 2014) totaled more than \$2.225 billion for one year, already exceeding the \$2 billion the FCC proposes for two years.

It is my hope that the final changes to the E-Rate program position to program to continue to fulfill its original promise of connectivity in the broader context of equity, local decision making, and technological neutrality. More specifically to the FCC's proposal:


- I oppose any effort to set aside a specific portion of E-Rate dollars for Priority Two: The concept of a carve out/set aside for Priority Two sets up the very real

threat of 'robbing Peter to pay Paul', whereby the set aside for Priority Two would encroach on Priority One, leaving both priorities to be rationed.

- I oppose any proposal that would distribute E-Rate funding on the basis of a per-capita (ie, per-student) basis: Beyond an inability to recognize high-cost service factors that often impact rural and small schools, a per-capita approach is a step away from E-Rate's historical focus on equity. With a historic focus on concentrations of poverty, the very act of diluting funding to a pupil (or class, or building) level is antithetical to combating concentrations of poverty. Per capita limits are poor proxies for ensuring that funds remain targeted on the neediest populations."
- I support a streamlined administrative process: Streamlining of the administrative process includes an improved online filing process and a reduced administrative burden, such as allowing for multi-year applications and a renewal form designed for applicants making no changes to a previous year's application.
- I continue to support voice services: Voice remains an important E-Rate service for our schools. Removing voice services from the eligible services list does not negate my district's very real need for working phones, for everything from simple contact to emergency communication. The shift would translate into an increased fiscal pressure on my district's budget.
- I oppose demonstration projects within E-Rate funding: Any pilot project, no matter its potential, simply siphons limited dollars away from the historically oversubscribed E-Rate program. Any incursion on the E-rate program – whether it be from a new service, a new class of applicants, or a new program (as the proposed pilot would be) – would significantly destabilize the program.

Thank you for considering my response as you move forward with your decision on the E-Rate program. I applaud the FCC for its continued efforts to protect the already oversubscribed E-Rate program by ensuring the future of this successful program. I urge you to support significant increased funding for the E-Rate program, and to ensure that the program and its limited resources are protected and preserved.

Sincerely,



Paul Leonhard  
Department of Technology  
Rockbridge County Schools  
1972 Big Spring Drive  
Lexington, VA 24450